



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879

VOL. IV

NEW YORK, OCTOBER 22, 1910

No. 4

Teachers of the Classics who have been for years striving by means of their work to develop the minds of the students under their influence and instil into them habits of exact and continuous study have understood fully the fallacy of the elective system and the immeasurable damage done to the cause of pure culture by the work of ex-President Eliot of Harvard University. Since Professor Lowell has been attempting to remedy in part the mischief done by Harvard's forty years of perversity, we teachers of the Classics have not solaced ourselves with the time-honored 'I told you so', but have rather looked seriously to the future with the hope that, after all, the pendulum had not swung too far in the wrong direction. This sentiment is well voiced by Professor J. Irving Manatt of Brown University, who, in an article in the May number of *The American College*, addresses a plea to the students of Brown University for the conservation of the Classics. Leaving out the sentences of rather far-fetched humor with which Professor Manatt enlivens his words, I quote the following:

Every educated man is, willy nilly, a trustee of the world's accumulated culture. If this treasure of the race be bartered for a mess of pottage, every man in this company must share the responsibility; and I pray you not to shirk it. Here, elsewhere, we want directors who direct; watchmen who keep awake. You know as well as I do how the intellectual and spiritual climate has changed in our time; how our seats of learning have become seats of everything but learning; how (as President Lowell puts it) "Athletics has beaten scholarship out of sight". President Eliot began his long administration by claiming for the Harvard degree "nothing less than four years devoted to liberal culture"; he closed it as the advocate of a three years' course which might include such broad and liberal studies as coal mining, ore dressing, foundry practice and blacksmithing! Specialization making sharp men and dissipation making shallow ones had run full course not at Harvard only, but in the college world at large; and it was high time for Mr. Lowell's new policy—"to develop the best all-round men in the United States". He has begun well by scotching the hydra that beset the springs—the myriad-headed monstrosity dubbed free election which really spells free damnation. But it remains to be seen whether even a Harvard president can graft a backbone into a jellyfish; whether anything short of knife and cautery can save the game.

Right here at the turn of the road is the real educator's opportunity and obligation. We want a

reevaluation of studies in a larger view of the end of all study, which is the making of all-round men. And we need not be surprised if it be found that these man-making studies are, in the main, just the good old humanities, with their source and centre in Greek, but radiating out (as all Greek things do) into manifold developments of sweetness and light and power. The last man you would take for a *laudator temporis acti* is our own Andrews; and he declares that "no modern community can, as a community, dispense with Greek studies except as it elects to be barbaric". That is a judgment worth weighing and history sustains it. We cannot with impunity drop Greek out of our national culture. That has been done more than once in history and always with disastrous consequences.

The plea has been made so often that its iteration sometimes seems to be wearisome and, as far as Greek is concerned, I very much fear that Greek has been dropped out of our national culture. Fortunately the power of Greek culture does not depend entirely upon the persistence of Greek studies. The torch of learning was carried through the revival of learning without any serious knowledge of Greek. The previous centuries of education, whatever education was, were largely Greek in foundation but Greek through Latin forms and the advocates of classical culture need not despair completely because Greek has vanished from the preparatory school. If the teachers of Latin do their duty, Greek influence will not have vanished and meanwhile there will be the chosen few who have continued to draw their inspiration immediately from the fountains. I do not mean that Latin is a form of Greek culture. Some teachers of Greek have been inclined to scorn Latin on this ground but, whatever may be said to the contrary, Greek has been preserved to the modern world by means of Latin and the spirit of Greek need not fail so long as Latin remains vigorous. If, therefore, the teachers of Greek are alive to the situation, they will champion the cause of Latin and strengthen it wherever they can, for he that helps the cause of Latin aids the persistence of Greek influence.

G. L.

## THE PRESENT STATUS OF LATIN TEXT CRITICISM

Criticism of the text of an author, ancient or modern, is of course the first step that scholars must take before they can begin their detailed study

of the text for the purpose of historical or literary interpretation or comparison with other authors in respect to style, vocabulary, syntax, or for any other of the manifold purposes for which a work is approached. When we remember that the use of a text for any scholarly purpose whatsoever presupposes that it is, to the last letter, in the exact form in which the creator of it intended it to be, we realize at once the absolute necessity for accurate textual criticism. This, of course, does not mean that the world of scholarship must stand still until the textual critic has entirely finished his work, any more than it means that the textual critic must suspend his labors until he has the use of all the valuable MSS now buried under *Herculaneum*. It does mean that his importance should be recognized.

No doubt you grant all this and wonder why I should take up your time to tell it to you; I simply wish to call it to your attention in order to prepare for my coming remarks.

As far as the classical Latin authors are concerned the subject of textual criticism itself is subdivided into several fields. If we had left to us in legible writing the original MSS of the authors, and if these MSS had never been changed by hands other than those which first wrote them, and if we were absolutely certain of these points, then the problems of textual criticism would not be. The careful preparation of the printer's copy from the MSS would be the only task of the textual critic. Would that it were so! Under existing conditions the first step is to examine such MSS as remain, and to decide which is, or are, the best of any given work. When we have gleaned all that we can from the MSS we are ready to resort to emendation. Now there are many different kinds of emendation, as many as there are different kinds of men—the emendations of inspiration, the emendations reached by logical deduction, and the emendations that do not emend. Some men are born emenders, others make themselves emenders—while the rest of us have emendations thrust upon us. Not that I do not believe in emendation, but I do believe that much of it is unnecessary and easily avoidable.

My point then is merely to urge the importance of MS study. It is to this branch of textual criticism that I shall mainly devote myself in this paper.

Let me say at once that this work is important not merely to some but to all; not solely to the college professor, but also to the secondary school teacher. Lack of time forbids detailed examples to substantiate my statements; suffice it to say for the benefit of the high school teacher that the text of many of Cicero's Orations is being considerably altered by recent work in textual criticism.

There are some people who believe that all that

can be done with the MSS has been done and that, therefore, they are justified in resorting to emendation. Nothing can be farther from the truth, and I trust that I shall make clear to you the absurdity of such a view. Others believe that the MS problem is insoluble and that for this reason they may disregard it and resort to emendation. Perhaps parts of the problem *are* insoluble, and certainly many parts of it are extremely difficult, but if we grant the great importance of it, as I think we must, then it should not be abandoned until extraordinary efforts have been made to solve it. Others, again, believe that the results of such study are not of importance commensurate with the time that is spent on it. These are the hardest to reckon with and some of them cannot be convinced. But surely even the smallest contribution to our knowledge of what the ancient authors really wrote is worth a large expenditure of time and effort. Merely to prove that a text that is generally accepted is based on good MS support is, in my estimation, a valuable contribution.

After this long and top-heavy introduction I can approach my subject. We are told that the present does not really exist—that it is merely a point from which one views the past and the future. And so in discussing the present status of Latin textual criticism we must perforce take a glimpse at the past and consider the outlook for the future. My outline of the history of the subject pretends to be nothing more than a slight sketch, and one, moreover, which does not take all factors into account.

The ancients themselves indulged in textual criticism, especially in emendation. The habit of emending continued through the Middle Ages and during the Renaissance flourished to an unprecedented degree. The Italian Humanists were so thoroughly immersed in Latin that their emendations were often highly successful. They, moreover, realized that the older a MS was the more valuable it was likely to be, but they were not expert enough to date MSS with any degree of definiteness, and besides, when given MSS of about equal age, either could not, or would not, distinguish the better from the worse. The MSS of the 15th century are, more than those of any other period, editions containing variants from other MSS, good or bad, and emendations of Renaissance scholars or would-be scholars. The most thoroughly 'corrected' MS was the one most eagerly sought for copying purposes. The introduction of printing brought no immediate change, inasmuch as highly 'corrected' MSS were often chosen as a basis for the texts of the first printed editions. Commentaries, critical and hermeneutic, had existed even in the MSS, and were retained in the printed editions. Gradually the critical notes became more ample, the references to MSS more definite. But the choice of MSS by editors

of the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries was quite haphazard, complete collations were not given, the relations of MSS to each other were not studied, and carelessness characterized the whole. I have elsewhere shown that these statements are true even of one of the most reliable of these early editors<sup>1</sup>. The work of others has proved that the references to MSS of Scaliger, Bosius, Cruquius, Barth and a host of others are full of fraud or carelessness, or both. I would suggest a canon of criticism that ought to be adopted by all textual critics: A scholar of the period between the 15th and 18th centuries who quotes readings from MSS is guilty of fraud or gross carelessness until he is proved innocent. If this principle were rigorously adhered to, it would be a great step in advance. The stranglehold which Cruquius had on the textual criticism of Horace has only recently been loosened.

Just as the motion of the waves is only apparently a forward movement of the water, so in these centuries there was an activity in the stormy sea of textual criticism that seemed to be progress, but was not. More and more MSS were consulted and quoted, and no edition was complete without new readings drawn from all sorts of MSS. The climax came toward the end of the 18th century. I will mention a typical example. Laurens van Santen was one of the last of the many scholars of this period who made Holland famous for its classical learning. He was particularly interested in the poems of Catullus, Propertius and Tibullus. He completed Burmann's edition of Propertius, left incomplete by Burmann's death, and published as a 'specimen' the 68th poem of Catullus, the Manlius elegy, intending to publish later a complete edition of Catullus. He gives us two reasons for his specimen edition: first, that he may have the benefit of the judgment and criticism of scholars, and second, that he may collect from all quarters ("undique") more material for establishing the correct text and that he may invite all to impart to him such material as they may have an opportunity of collecting. Santen's library is now in Berlin, and all his collections of material are to be found there. In looking these over one finds collations of MSS in many forms by many men, collations of old editions, collations of editions with old MS notes. Santen tried to get a collation of every existing MS and edition, that he himself did not own, of the three authors mentioned. He spared no expense and he spared not his friends. And how did he make use of all this material? His principle, or lack of principle, was to select the reading that in his judgment and according to his taste was best, no matter what the source. Of course he often noticed that one MS was dependent on another, but that was of no

importance in his eyes. The reading was the thing. Now if Santen's judgment had been infallible and we knew it to be so, this method would be the only proper and easy one. But it was not. We all know that even the greatest scholars disagree on matters of text.

Santen's specimen edition of the 68th poem of Catullus contains 67 quarto pages of text and notes, critical and explanatory. At this rate his complete edition would have filled about 1400 quarto pages without index: interpretative commentary had kept pace with critical commentary. The bulkiest editions of the Latin Classics are those published in the 18th century.

We may readily surmise that it was this cumbersome bulk that brought the reaction which came less than a century ago, and, as a matter of fact, Lachmann tells us in his edition of Tibullus of 1829 that he thought it time to put the small text of Tibullus into one small booklet, instead of into two large volumes as had been the custom. That Lachmann marks an epoch in textual criticism is a commonplace, and, in some respects, is certainly true. He promulgated the principle of selection of MSS, and argued that emendation should not be resorted to unless the selected MSS failed to give intelligible readings. His principle was excellent, and we have learned to take it for granted, but his methods of application were distinctly poor. He chose the most convenient MSS on which to base his texts, and did not think it worth while to go to any great pains to search for unknown MSS. In the one sense, then, in that he gave to the world his policy of selection and introduced the present concise form of textual apparatus, his work marks a distinct advance; in the other sense, in that he had no desire to look far or long for MSS, he kept the critical world at a standstill for many years. For his views, both good and bad, found wide acceptance. Even to this day classical scholarship is deeply infected with Lachmann's indifference and lack of curiosity concerning unreported MSS.

But if Lachmann's influence was widespread, yet it did not stop progress altogether. Here and there a man was found whose curiosity led him to look for new MSS. A typical example is Emil Baehrens. In the 1870's and 1880's he examined a large number of MSS of many Latin authors and discovered some that were extremely important. For example, in the case of Tibullus, he found the only complete MS that antedates the 15th century—and there are several hundred MSS of Tibullus in existence. Nor did he make his finds in obscure or inaccessible libraries. He made them in libraries like the Ambrosian at Milan and the Laurentian at Florence, where they had been readily accessible to any who cared to look. It is almost inconceivable to us that for fifty years after Lachmann had made his pro-

<sup>1</sup> The Identification of the MSS of Catullus Cited in Statius' Edition of 1566 (Chicago, 1908).

nouncement on the selection of MSS, these MSS, easily recognizable as valuable, remained unnoticed. This circumstance is an interesting example to show how Lachmann's indifference to unreported MSS had spread over the learned world.

Baehrens, too, had his faults. He selected some very bad MSS as a basis for his texts, and was, moreover, an extremely careless collator. Yet his work has in several cases been allowed to stand until the present day. His poor MSS have not been rejected and his good MSS have not been recollated—and this in spite of his notorious carelessness, so notorious that even Sandys, in his *History of Classical Scholarship*, a work generally so laudatory, comments on it. Here is an instance. Baehrens discovered F, one of the two complete MSS of Propertius which antedate the 15th century. It is generally recognized as important. In Baehrens' collation of it, which appeared in his edition of Propertius in 1880, there are scores and probably hundreds of mistakes. Yet no new collation has ever been published<sup>1</sup>.

Thus we are brought to our own times. And now I must present to you in brief the thoughts which suggested this paper. First of all, some criticisms must be made. Many editors are still in the thrall of Lachmann. They will not exert themselves in order to find new MS support. Many also are still following in the footsteps of Baehrens and those like him, holding tenaciously to some of the atrocious MSS selected by their predecessors, and making no attempt to correct some of the miserable collations of the good MSS. Baehrens' careless collating was not peculiar to him. Many editors who actually do collate MSS seem to think that inaccuracy is excusable because of haste. They probably never think of the harm that is done in fields of investigation that depend on the text, or else they might have a greater sense of responsibility.

The Teubner series of Latin Classics is in many ways an admirable one. Its cheapness, its neatness, its uniformity of appearance and arrangement, its convenient form, and the names of well-known scholars on its title-pages have served to exalt it to a very high position. But we have, I fear, gone too far and have held it well-nigh perfect. The editions are of uneven merit; a few excellent, some good, and many bad.

National prejudice, which has played an important role in other fields of scholarship, is still a bane in the field of textual criticism. Catullus has been peculiarly unfortunate in this respect. Lachmann chose two Berlin MSS (they were the most convenient, for he lived in Berlin) on which to base his text. Both of these are clearly inferior MSS, but one of them, the Datanus, the Germans are very

reluctant to give up, as there is no other MS of Catullus in Germany that is of any value. It is a very sad state of affairs, for it is to the Germans that we have looked for most of the work in textual criticism, as in other fields of scholarship. The French have a valuable MS of Catullus in the *Germanensis* in Paris. But the way in which French scholars resent the slightest suggestion that this MS is not perfect is amusing as well as sad.

With the introduction of Lachmann's canon of selection of MSS came the troublesome problem of making the correct selection. We have seen that Lachmann's judgment in this respect was often faulty, and that Baehrens' judgment was by no means perfect. The most perplexing problem that has confronted the text critic since Lachmann's day has been the application of his principle. The method in use has been, naturally enough, the comparison of readings. The MS with the better reading is the better MS. But people differ widely in their views of the value of readings. Besides, many really good readings are emendations of early scholars (for the owners of MSS, often being scholars, emended their MSS, and their emendations were copied into other MSS), and mislead us in our endeavor to trace MS tradition. That such emendations found their way into MSS, especially into those of the 15th century, has long been known, but scholars have been very lax in weeding them out. The great difficulty of deciding between MSS on the basis of good or bad readings alone, a difficulty that has been enormously increased by the publication of collations full of errors of omission and commission, is due to the subjective nature of the work. So it has been possible for one man after another to write a doctoral dissertation demolishing his predecessor's work to the satisfaction at least of himself and his professor. Thus it is, too, that so many scholars have become disgusted with the unsubstantial character of the work on MS relationships and have either disregarded it or persistently poked fun at it. Just as the inefficient teacher of Latin—and he is no rarity—has been largely responsible for the attack on Latin, so the careless textual critic has brought his subject into something like disrepute in certain quarters.

The criticisms made thus far might leave one in a very pessimistic state. But there is cause for optimism. There are certain tendencies in the field of textual criticism which promise a bright future.

Even Baehrens had been interested to some extent in the history of the MSS he used. The tendency at present is to give a good deal of attention to this subject, inasmuch as the tracing of the history of a MS may be of considerable help in determining its relations to other MSS. This historical study, or study of external evidence, as it may roughly be described, in distinction from the internal evidence

<sup>1</sup> I may state here that I expect soon to publish a new collation of this MS.

of the text itself, is of especial value because it is objective, rather than subjective. Taken alone, there is not enough of it to settle all our problems, but when used in conjunction with internal evidence, it leads to certain and valuable results.

Let us see what the study of the external evidence involves. It involves the study of mediaeval and Renaissance libraries and of their catalogues. It involves the study of the History of Scholarship throughout the centuries. It involves the study of the History of Latin Literature and Philology during the Middle Ages and the Renaissance.

As an instance of the results that are gained from a study of library catalogues let me mention merely the important discoveries made by A. C. Clark through an ancient catalogue of MSS regarding the *Vetus Cluniacensis* of Cicero's Orations. In the investigation of the Mediaeval period, the remarkable work of Traube, short-lived as he was, has attracted wide attention, and has left a lasting influence for good. The work is being carried on by his pupils, of whom there is a fair number in the United States. At the forefront of the study of the Italian Renaissance, from the viewpoint of the student of the text-tradition of Latin authors, stands Sabbadini. Many other Italians are busily engaged in the field but very few Americans are actively working in it, extremely important as it is. I would strongly urge that we give more attention to it.

Another encouraging tendency is that scholars are beginning to examine all the existing MSS of the different works. It is highly important that lists be made of the MSS for every work, and that these MSS be carefully examined. The best results will come from complete collations, but in many instances the bulk of the work makes this, for the present at least, impossible. The early editions should be examined just as the MSS are, and the MS notes in early editions should be studied. Finally the critical commentaries of the editors up to the middle of the last century must be investigated and their references to MSS evaluated. And thus the cycle will be complete; again our aim will be to examine all the existing material, just as it was the aim of Santen and his fellows. But the difference in purpose and in method will give far different results.

In conclusion, I would call attention to the opportunity that we Americans have. There is a large amount of work to be done which demands acuteness and patience, qualities that are the property of American scholarship. We are handicapped by our distance from the fields of work. The situation can be partly met by inducing our philanthropists to purchase the few private libraries of Europe which are still purchasable.

Shortly before his death a few years ago Mommsen said to Grenfell: "The nineteenth century was the century of epigraphy, the twentieth will be that

of palaeography". He had reference to the Egyptian finds, and to the prospective finds at Herculaneum—when that site is finally uncovered. To my mind, the twentieth century will be the age of palaeography not only in the sense which Mommsen meant, but also in the much wider sense for which I have just been pleading.

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH.

B. L. ULLMAN.

## REVIEWS

In the publication of aids for the classical student the Germans lead the world. At the one extreme we have such monumental productions as the Pauly-Wissowa *Real-Encyclopädie*, Roscher's *Lexicon of Mythology*, Baumeister's *Denkmäler*, Müller's *Handbuch*, at the other books small in price, meant evidently to make in part, at least, a popular appeal, that put before the student a vast amount of material in a form most attractive and helpful, and at the same time make but slight drain upon his pocket-book.

It is of a book which falls within the latter class that I would speak at present. During the summer I noted in the salesrooms of G. E. Stechert and Co. a most attractive book entitled *Kunst und Leben im Altertum*, by Hugo Muzik, a Gymnasial Professor in Vienna, and Franz Perschinka, Landesschulinspektor in Trieste (Wien, Tempsky: Leipzig, Freytag (1900)). The book costs 4.40 Marks. The main part of it consists of 170 pages of photographs, diagrams, restorations, etc., illustrating (1) *Kunstgeschichte*, *Topographie*, *Mythologie*, (2) *Kulturgeschichte*. Often there are several cuts on one page; the book thus contains many hundreds of figures. I know of no investment of a dollar which a teacher of the Classics will find more profitable than this book.

It is manifestly impossible to present many details concerning such a volume. The first fifty pages of illustrations deal with art in Egypt, Assyria and Babylonia, Persia and Asia Minor, with art in Greece from the Mycenaean age to the Hellenistic, with art in Italy. The section on topography (51-97) deals with Athens, Greece outside Athens, Sicily, Rome, the Vicinity of Rome, Pompeii, the Apennines and Etruria, and Roman monuments outside Italy. In these pages in particular much that is not accessible to every one has been put together. In the second part, under the head of *Kulturgeschichte* (98-170), we have a great collection of most helpful material on *Öffentliches Leben*, *Gottesdienstliche Altertümer*, *Kriegswesen* (of Greeks, Romans, and Barbarians), *Seewesen*, *das Haus* (Greek and Roman), *Mahlzeiten*, *Hausrat*, *Tracht und Schmuck*, *Hochzeit und Kindererziehung*, *Gymnastik und öffentliche Spiele*, *Theater*, *Ackerbau*, *Handel und Gewerbe*, *Münzen*, *Bestattung*. I can best sum up my impression of the book by saying that